

# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 902

IR 001 084

**AUTHOR** Collins, Allan M.  
**TITLE** Comparison of Two Teaching Strategies in Computer-Assisted Instruction. Report No. 2885.  
**INSTITUTION** Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.  
**SPONS AGENCY** Advanced Research Projects Agency (DOD), Washington, D.C.; Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C.  
**REPORT NO** BBN-2885  
**PUB DATE** Sep 74  
**NOTE** 50p.  
  
**EDRS PRICE** MF-\$0.75 HC-\$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE  
**DESCRIPTORS** \*Comparative Analysis; \*Computer Assisted Instruction; Geography; Learning Theories; \*Secondary School Students; \*Teaching Methods; \*Tutoring  
**IDENTIFIERS** Block Test Mode; SCHOLAR; Tutorial Mode

## ABSTRACT

Three experiments were run using the SCHOLAR CAI (computer assisted instruction) system to teach geography to high school students. The experiments compared a method of teaching derived from analysis of human tutors (Tutorial Mode) vs. a method derived from programmed instruction (Block-Test Mode). In the three experiments, Block-Test Mode was systematically converged toward Tutorial Mode in order to pinpoint what aspects of teaching strategy affected student's learning. Tutorial Mode was significantly more effective in the first two experiments, and nonsignificantly effective in the third. The results indicated that the major factor affecting the student's learning was the strategy that tutors use of reviewing the material in greater depth on a second pass. Allowing the students to ask questions, and the tutorial strategy for relating new material to the student's previous knowledge contributed only a small amount to the differences found in the first two experiments. (Author)

BBN Report No. 2885

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPARISON OF TWO TEACHING STRATEGIES  
IN  
COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned  
this document for processing  
to:

IR So

In our judgement, this document  
is also of interest to the clearing-  
houses noted to the right. Index-  
ing should reflect their special  
points of view.

Allan M. Collins

September 1974

Sponsored by

Office of Naval Research and the  
Advanced Research Projects Agency

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.  
Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for  
any purpose of the United States Government.

**COMPARISON OF TWO TEACHING STRATEGIES  
IN COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION**

**Allan M. Collins**

**Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc.**

**Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION**

**THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY**

**Contract No. N00014-71-C-0228, dated March 1, 1971  
Amendment Modification No. P00002, dated January 1, 1973  
Expiration Date, June 30, 1975  
Total Amount of Contract \$586,000  
Principal Investigator, Allan M. Collins [(617) 491-1850]**

**Sponsored by: Office of Naval Research  
Contract Authority No. NR 154-330  
Scientific Officers: Dr. Marshall Farr and  
Dr. Joseph Young**

**and**

**Advanced Research Projects Agency  
ARPA Order No. 2284, dated August 30, 1973  
Program Code No. 61101E**

**The views and conclusions contained in this document are those  
of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily  
representing the official policies, either expressed or implied,  
of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Office of Naval  
Research, or the U.S. Government.**

**Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. Reproduc-  
tion in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the  
United States Government.**

## UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER <b>Technical Report No. 3</b>	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) <b>COMPARISON OF TWO TEACHING STRATEGIES IN COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION</b>		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED <b>Semi-Annual (1 Feb 74 - 31 Jul 74)</b>
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER <b>BBN Report No. 2885</b>
7. AUTHOR(S) <b>Allan M. Collins</b>		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(S) <b>No. N00014-71-C-0228</b>
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS <b>Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc. 50 Moulton St., Cambridge, Mass.</b>		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS <b>61153N RR042-06; PR042-06-01 NR154-330</b>
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS <b>Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, VA 22217</b>		12. REPORT DATE <b>September 1974</b>
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>47</b>
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) <b>Unclassified</b>
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.</b>		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES  <b>To be submitted to Educational Journal</b>		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  <b>CAI, teaching methods, education, learning theory</b>		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  <b>Three experiments were run using the SCHOLAR CAI system to teach geography to high-school students. The experiments compared a method of teaching derived from analysis of human tutors (Tutorial Mode) vs. a method derived from programmed instruction (Block-Test Mode). In the three experiments, Block-Test Mode was systematically converged toward Tutorial Mode in order to pinpoint what aspects of teaching strategy affected</b>		

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

20. ABSTRACT (cont).

student's learning. Tutorial Mode was significantly more effective in the first two experiments, and nonsignificantly in the third. The results indicated that the major factor affecting student's learning was the strategy that tutors use of reviewing the material in greater depth on a second pass. Allowing the students to ask questions, and the tutorial strategy for relating new material to the student's previous knowledge contributed only a small amount to the differences found in the first two experiments.

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHOD.....	6
Tutorial Mode.....	8
Block-Test Mode.....	12
Testing Procedure.....	17
EXPERIMENT 1.....	20
Method.....	20
Results and Discussion.....	21
EXPERIMENT 2.....	24
Method.....	24
Results and Discussion.....	25
EXPERIMENT 3.....	28
Method.....	28
Results and Discussion.....	29
DISCUSSION.....	31
REFERENCES.....	34
DISTRIBUTION LIST.....	36

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was sponsored by the Personnel and Training Research Programs, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research, under Contract No. N00014-71-C-0228, Contract Authority Identification Number, NR No. 154-330. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

I would like to thank our contract monitors, Dr. Marshall Farr and Dr. Joseph Young, who have contributed many ideas to our research on teaching methods. I would also like to thank Joseph J. Passafiume, Nelleke Aiello, Eleanor H. Warnock, and Susan M. Graesser who programmed the various teaching strategies in SCHOLAR, ran the subjects, and analyzed the data. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Thomas J. Triggs who developed the experimental design and Dr. Richard W. Pew for his comments on a draft of this report.

## INTRODUCTION

When Carbonell (1970) developed the SCHOLAR CAI system, he created a new type of generative CAI system, capable of carrying on a tutorial dialogue with students. In SCHOLAR knowledge about geography is stored in a semantic network (Quillian, 1968) of facts and concepts, structured like human memory (Collins and Quillian, 1972a). Dialogue with the student is handled by a variety of procedures that utilize the knowledge stored in the semantic network. Different procedures can be used to ask the student questions, evaluate his answers, correct his errors, answer his questions, and present him with new information. Because the information in SCHOLAR is distinct from the procedures used for teaching that information, it is possible to vary the teaching strategy while holding the information constant. This makes it possible to compare different teaching methods in a systematic manner.

Such an evaluation can be made by attempting to teach students the same domain of information with different versions of SCHOLAR, and measuring their learning by comparing pre-test and post-test scores on the material covered. In the three experiments reported here, we compared two different methods of teaching in SCHOLAR, one derived from analysis of tutorial dialogues (called Tutorial Mode) and one derived from programmed learning (called Block-Test Mode).



In order to implement a Tutorial Mode in SCHOLAR, we studied actual human tutoring of South American geography to see how teachers adapt their teaching to the individual student (Collins, Warnock, and Passafiume, 1975). Several important findings from this earlier study related to the ways that tutors select topics, interweave questioning and presentation, and review previous material. Together with the ability to answer student questions, these aspects are basic to the way Tutorial Mode operated in the three experiments.

The topic selection strategy used by the best tutors produced a structure of topics and subtopics like an outline for a course. For example, the tutor might start off with a question like "Do you know any geographical features of South America?" If the student mentioned the Andes, for example, then the tutor would discuss various aspects of the Andes for a while, perhaps including as a subtopic the highest mountain in the Andes, named Aconcagua. After exhausting the important information under the Andes, the tutor would usually ask about other geographical features, like the Amazon or Cape Horn. Each of these would be discussed for a while until the major geographical features were covered, at which point the tutor would pick a new topic such as regions or countries. Thus the topics and subtopics form a nested outline structure, with the tutor probing a little way into each subtopic, and then popping up to the previous level when the important information is exhausted at the lower level.

The way the tutor interweaves questioning and presentation is the essence of how the tutor relates his teaching to the individual student. The dialogues showed that the tutors' questions occur at the top-level and beginning topics in the outline. This is because the tutor starts out asking questions to find out what the student already knows, and then presents new material that is related to the student's previous knowledge. The object seems to be to tie as much information as the student can assimilate into the structure of his previous knowledge (Collins and Quillian, 1972b; Norman, 1973).

The other important aspect of tutoring that we have implemented in SCHOLAR is reviewing. In the dialogues we analyzed, the better tutors went over the material on a second pass, asking about things the student didn't know the first time through, and adding more detail to the structure of information built up on the first pass. The tutorial method as a whole reflected a strategy Norman (1973) refers to as web teaching, where the teacher first tries to establish a framework of basic knowledge and then fills in more and more detail on subsequent passes, much like a spider spinning a web.

In contrast to the tutorial method of teaching, the strategy used in programmed instruction involves presenting small amounts of information, and then asking questions about the information

just presented. We built a version of this strategy into Block-Test mode, which first presents a block of information followed by questions about that block. Block-Test Mode follows the same topic selection strategy as Tutorial Mode, but unlike Tutorial Mode the student can not ask questions.

The programmed instruction strategy in various forms is used widely in CAI. But there is a fundamental problem to this method of instruction: in order for a student to answer most of the questions he is asked, he ends up half parroting back something he read a little earlier in slightly different form. There is at least some evidence in the psychological literature that this leads to little long-term retention. In particular Craik (1971) and McCabe and Madigan (1971) found that in list learning, information recalled from the end of the list is unlikely to be remembered later, because it is recalled out of short term memory without the effort necessary to retain it longer. A similar effect in paired-associate learning underlies the advantage of the anticipation method (where presentation of the first member of the pair precedes presentation of the pair) over the prompting method (where presentation of the pair precedes presentation of the first member). This is because the prompting method involves repeating back what one has just read. These results suggest that the way Tutorial Mode combines questioning and presentation may provide an advantage over Block-Test Mode. In the context of CAI such a tutorial strategy

is only possible in a generative system like SCHOLAR.

In order to explore what aspects of the two teaching strategies affect students' learning, we conducted a series of three experiments. Block-Test Mode was converged toward Tutorial Mode during the course of the experiments in order to pinpoint what differences between the modes had the major effects on students' learning.

## METHOD

This section describes the way the two modes operated in the experiments and the testing procedures used. Three experiments were run altogether, each with eight high-school students. Each student learned about two South American countries in Tutorial Mode, and two countries in Block-Test Mode. Thus, students served as their own controls. Students' learning was measured by the difference between pre- and post-test scores on a pencil and paper test.

The best way to understand how the two modes operated is to compare protocols from the two modes with the part of the semantic information network on which the protocols are based. Figure 1 shows part of the entry under Chile that was used in the protocols shown in Figs. 2 and 3. Any topic stored under Chile has an entry elsewhere in the semantic network and can become a topic in its own right, as happened with the Central Valley in Figure 2. The entry for the Central Valley shown in Figure 1 illustrates how each of the things referred to under Chile are expanded elsewhere in the network.

What should be stressed about the data base is the outline structure of information, and the importance tags or I-tags (I0 to I6) associated with each fact. The structure of information in the data base parallels the nested structure of topics and sub-topics selected by the better tutors. The topic selection strategy described was therefore applied directly to the data base structure.

## CHILE

SUPERCONCEPT (I0) COUNTRY  
LOCATION (I0)  
IN (I0)  
SOUTH/AMERICA (I0) SOUTHWESTERN  
BORDERING COUNTRIES (I1)  
NORTHERN (I2) PERU  
NORTHEASTERN (I2) BOLIVIA  
EASTERN (I1) ARGENTINA  
BOUNDARY (I2) ANDES  
COAST (I1)  
WESTERN (I1) PACIFIC  
ON (I0) HUMBOLDT/CURRENT  
SOUTHERN (I3) ANTARCTIC  
CAPITAL (I0) SANTIAGO  
REGIONS (I1) \$L CENTRAL/VALLEY ATACAMA/DESERT SOUTHERN/ANDES  
PEOPLE (I2)  
LANGUAGE (I0) SPANISH  
RELIGION (I2)  
PRINCIPAL (I0) CATHOLICISM  
POPULATION (I3)  
APPROX (I0) 9,000,000  
CITIES (I3)  
PRINCIPAL (I0) \$L SANTIAGO VALPARAISO CONCEPCION  
ANTOFAGASTA ARICA VINA/DEL/MAR PUNTA/ARENAS IQUIQUE

## CENTRAL/VALLEY

SUPERCONCEPT (I0) VALLEY REGION  
LOCATION (I0)  
IN (I0)  
CHILE (I0) CENTRAL  
ON (I0)  
COAST (I0)  
OF (I0) PACIFIC  
CLIMATE (I2)  
TEMPERATURE (I0) TEMPERATE MEDITERRANEAN  
PRODUCTS (I2)  
AGRICULTURAL (I0) \$L WHEAT GRAPES WINE

Fig. 1. Partial Entries for Chile and Central Valley in SCHOLAR's Data Base.

The I-tags reflect the varying degrees of importance of different facts in the data base, the most important having the tag I0. These guide the topic selection strategy in picking the most important information at each choice point, and in deciding when to pop up to more important topics. The \$L that occurs in the data base indicates that the following elements form a list.

### Tutorial Mode

In the experiments, Tutorial Mode selected topics in order of importance. It started out asking the student questions about each topic (e.g., the location of Chile or the people of Chile). As long as the student answered correctly, it went deeper into the topic until time was used up for that topic or there was no important information left (as measured by I-tags). But whenever the student made a mistake, SCHOLAR presented a few related facts and popped up to the next most important topic. In the first two experiments students were allowed to ask questions whenever they liked. In all the experiments, time was allocated between a first pass over the material and a review pass, where questions missed earlier were asked again. If there was time left over after the second pass, SCHOLAR would start on a third pass. The material was covered in more depth on each subsequent pass.

Figure 2 shows an excerpt from an actual protocol on Chile between Tutorial Mode and a high-school student in Experiment 2.

DialogueAnnotated Comments

WHAT IS CHILE?

\*COUNTRY IN SOUTH AMERICA\*

VERY GOOD.

This is the most important property of Chile. (A tutor would suppress it on the assumption that the student knows the answer.) In evaluating the answer, it looks for "country", ignores the rest.

CORRECT OR INCORRECT?  
CHILE IS IN NORTHERN SOUTH AMERICA.

Location is the next most important attribute under Chile.

\*INCORRECT\*

YOU ARE CORRECT.

The student answers correctly, so SCHOLAR will go deeper into Location.

CHILE IS IN SOUTHWESTERN SOUTH AMERICA.

THE EASTERN BORDERING COUNTRY OF CHILE  
IS ---.

This is the most important Bordering-Country of Chile.

\*I DON'T KNOW\*

THE ANSWER IS: ARGENTINA.

THE BOUNDARY OF THE EASTERN BORDERING  
COUNTRIES OF CHILE IS THE ANDES.

Since the student has missed the question, SCHOLAR presents some related information about Bordering-Countries.

THE NORTHERN BORDERING COUNTRY OF CHILE  
IS PERU.

THE NORTHEASTERN BORDERING COUNTRY IS  
BOLIVIA.

SCHOLAR would have gone on to ask about Coasts under Location, but it has run out of time for Location, so it goes to the next attribute, Capital.

WHAT IS THE CAPITAL OF CHILE?

\*WHAT ARE SOME CITIES IN CHILE\*

THE PRINCIPAL CITIES OF CHILE ARE  
SANTIAGO, VALPARAISO, CONCEPCION,  
ANTOFAGASTA, ARICA, VINA DEL MAR, PUNTA  
ARENAS, AND IQUIQUE.

The student gets some help, though without directly asking SCHOLAR's question.

Fig. 2a. An Annotated Transcript of the Beginning of a Dialogue Between Tutorial Mode of SCHOLAR and a High-School Student in Exp.2. (The Student's Inputs are Between Asterisks.)



NOW YOU CAN EITHER ANSWER MY QUESTION  
OR ASK A NEW ONE.

\*SANTIAGO\*

VERY GOOD.

IS THE FOLLOWING TRUE OR FALSE?  
SANTIAGO IS IN CENTRAL CHILE.

\*TRUE\*

THAT'S FINE.

THE REGIONS OF CHILE ARE ---.

\*I DON'T KNOW\*

THE ANSWER IS: THE CENTRAL VALLEY, THE  
ATACAMA DESERT, AND THE SOUTHERN ANDES.

THE CENTRAL VALLEY IS IN CENTRAL CHILE.  
IT IS ON THE COAST OF THE PACIFIC.

THE ATACAMA DESERT IS IN CHILE AND PERU.  
IT IS BETWEEN THE PACIFIC AND THE ANDES  
MOUNTAINS.

WHAT IS THE LANGUAGE OF CHILE?

\*SPANISH\*

YOU ARE CORRECT.

WHAT IS THE PRINCIPAL RELIGION OF CHILE?

\*I DON'T KNOW\*

THE ANSWER IS: CATHOLICISM.

Because the student is right, SCHOLAR goes into the data base entry for Santiago to ask more questions. (To go into an entry, the entry must have the main topic as a Superpart, i.e., it must be part of Chile.)

SCHOLAR has run out of the time allotted to Capital and so goes on to Regions. Time is allocated on the basis of the number of top-level attributes and their I-tag weights.

Since the student does not know any Regions, SCHOLAR gives the correct answer, plus some information about two of the Regions.

Language is under the top-level attribute Population. SCHOLAR goes on to Population not because of time but because the student doesn't know any Regions.

That's all SCHOLAR knows about Language, so it goes on to Religion, which is at the same level as Language under Population. The rest of the information about Religion is above the I-tag level for the first pass, so no related information is printed.

Fig. 2b. An Annotated Transcript of a Dialogue Between Tutorial Mode of SCHOLAR and a High-School Student in Exp. 2.  
(The Student's Inputs are Between Asterisks.)

## (Beginning of Review Pass)

THE EASTERN BORDERING COUNTRY OF CHILE  
IS ---.

\*I DON'T KNOW\*

THE ANSWER IS: ARGENTINA.

THE BOUNDARY OF THE EASTERN BORDERING  
COUNTRIES OF CHILE IS THE ANDES.

THE NORTHERN BORDERING COUNTRY OF CHILE  
IS PERU.

THE NORTHEASTERN BORDERING COUNTRY IS  
BOLIVIA.

WHAT ARE THE REGIONS OF CHILE?

\*CENTRAL VALLEY ATACAMA. DESSERT AND THE  
ANDES\*

"CENTRAL VALLEY" AND "ATACAMA DESERT"  
ARE FINE.

YOU COULD ALSO MENTION THE SOUTHERN  
ANDES.

I DON'T THINK "DESSERT" IS CORRECT.

THE ATACAMA DESERT IS IN CHILE AND PERU.  
IT IS BETWEEN THE PACIFIC AND THE ANDES  
MOUNTAINS.

THE SOUTHERN ANDES ARE IN SOUTHWESTERN  
SOUTH AMERICA.

THEY ARE IN ARGENTINA AND CHILE.

IS IT TRUE THAT THE CENTRAL VALLEY IS  
IN CENTRAL CHILE?

\*YES\*

VERY GOOD.

On the second pass, SCHOLAR  
skips to the first piece of  
information the student  
missed earlier.

Since the student misses it  
again, the same related in-  
formation as before prints  
outs. SCHOLAR knows that  
this information was presented  
earlier, and we may revise  
SCHOLAR so that it asks about  
the related information here  
instead of presenting it again.

The student missed this the  
first time. A new answer  
evaluation module points out  
that the Andes is right but  
more specifically it is the  
Southern Andes.

SCHOLAR recognizes Atacama as  
the Atacama Desert and does  
not understand Dessert.

Giving related information  
about the Atacama Desert was  
an error that has been corrected.

Because the student has named  
the Central Valley, SCHOLAR  
goes into the entry for Central  
Valley to ask questions about  
it. Like human tutors, SCHOLAR  
will go off and discuss what the  
student answers correctly. The  
dialogue continues with a whole  
series of questions about the  
Central Valley and the Atacama  
Desert.

Fig. 2c. An Annotated Transcript of the Beginning of the Review Pass  
Between Tutorial Mode of SCHOLAR and a High-School Student  
in Exp. 2.

In this experiment students were encouraged to ask questions, and one of these appears in the short excerpt shown. This excerpt also illustrates how the review pass skipped over questions answered earlier, and went into the material in greater depth than the first pass.

### Block-Test Mode

Instead of starting with questions like Tutorial Mode, Block-Test Mode presented a block of information and then asked questions about the facts presented. There was a screen over the teletype in the experiments that prevented subjects from looking back at the block during the questions. The version used in the first experiment asked once about all the facts presented in a block. The version used in the second and third experiments randomly selected two of the facts presented to ask about. For each question the student missed, this latter version would ask about an additional fact that was presented. Then it would ask about each fact the student missed once more, to see if he learned the right answer. When the questioning was over for one block, Block-Test Mode presented the next block and then asked questions about it. This cycle continued until the time was used up (except in Experiment 3 where time was divided between a first pass and a review pass, as in Tutorial Mode).

Block-Test Mode selected topics in the same order of importance as Tutorial Mode. Like Tutorial Mode, it went down deeper into a topic until time was used up for that topic or there was no important information left (as measured by I-tags). Unlike Tutorial Mode, it did not pop-up out of a topic when the student made a mistake, so that Block-Test Mode went into most topics in more depth.

Figure 3 shows an actual protocol about Chile between Block-Test Mode and a high-school student in Experiment 3. This excerpt illustrates all the different features that were incorporated into Block-Test Mode in the course of the three experiments. In particular, it illustrates the presentation of a block of facts, the random selection of facts to ask questions about, the inclusion of an additional question for each question the student missed, the repeat of each question the student missed within a block, and the review pass where the facts the student answered correctly on the first pass were skipped over. Block-Test Mode in Experiment 1 did not have most of these features as will be explained later, and in Experiment 2 did not include a review pass.

Dialogue

Annotated Comments

CHILE IS A COUNTRY.  
IT IS IN SOUTHWESTERN SOUTH AMERICA.  
THE EASTERN BORDERING COUNTRY IS ARGENTINA.  
THE BOUNDARY IS THE ANDES.

Four facts from the data base are presented as a block of information.

WHAT IS THE EASTERN BORDERING COUNTRY OF CHILE?

SCHOLAR then asks about one of the four facts chosen randomly.

\*ARGENTINA\*

The student answers correctly.

VERY GOOD.

WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY OF THE EASTERN BORDERING COUNTRIES OF CHILE?

SCHOLAR asks about a second fact, also chosen randomly.

\*PACIFIC\*

The student makes a mistake.

WRONG.

THE CORRECT ANSWER IS: THE ANDES.

WHAT IS CHILE?

SCHOLAR asks about more than two facts, because the student missed one of the two questions above.

\*A COUNTRY IN SOUTH AMERICA\*

The student answers correctly.

THAT'S FINE.

THE BOUNDARY OF THE EASTERN BORDERING COUNTRIES OF CHILE IS ---.

SCHOLAR reasks the question the student missed earlier.

\*ARGENTINA\*

The student missed again.

THAT'S NOT RIGHT.

SCHOLAR only reviews each missed question once.

THE CORRECT ANSWER IS: THE ANDES.

Fig. 3a. An Annotated Transcript of the Beginning of a Dialogue Between Block-Test Mode of SCHOLAR and a High-School Student in Exp. 3. (The Student's Inputs are Between Asterisks.)

THE NORTHERN BORDERING COUNTRY OF CHILE  
IS PERU.

THE NORTHEASTERN BORDERING COUNTRY IS  
BOLIVIA.

THE WESTERN COAST IS THE PACIFIC.  
IT IS ON THE HUMBOLDT CURRENT.

THE WESTERN COAST OF CHILE IS ---.

\*PACIFIC\*

THAT'S RIGHT.

IS THE FOLLOWING TRUE OR FALSE?

THE WESTERN COAST OF CHILE IS NOT ON THE  
HUMBOLDT CURRENT.

\*FALSE:

:  
FALSE\*

"FALSE" IS FINE.

I DON'T THINK "FALSE" IS CORRECT.

THE NORTHERN BORDERING COUNTRY OF  
CHILE IS ---.

\*DONT KNOEA\*

WRONG.

THE NORTHERN BORDERING COUNTRY OF CHILE  
IS PERU.

Having reviewed all the questions  
the student missed the first  
time, SCHOLAR presents a new  
block of information.

SCHOLAR is confused because  
the student typed "False"  
twice. It treats it as a  
wrong answer, and goes on.  
Nothing disastrous happens.

SCHOLAR doesn't recognize  
"Don't Know" because it is  
misspelled, and treats it as  
an error.

The dialogue continued through  
the rest of the first pass.

Fig. 3b. An Annotated Transcript of the Beginning of a Dialogue  
Between Block-Test Mode of SCHOLAR and a High-School  
Student in Exp. 3. (The Student's Inputs are Between Asterisks.)

(Beginning of Review Pass)

CHILE IS IN SOUTHWESTERN SOUTH AMERICA.  
THE BOUNDARY OF THE EASTERN BORDERING  
COUNTRIES IS THE ANDES.  
THE NORTHERN BORDERING COUNTRY IS PERU.  
THE NORTHEASTERN BORDERING COUNTRY IS  
BOLIVIA.

On the review pass, SCHOLAR  
skips the facts the student  
answered correctly on the first  
pass. It repeats those facts  
the student missed or was not  
asked about.

IS IT TRUE THAT CHILE IS IN SOUTHWESTERN  
SOUTH AMERICA?

\*YES\*

YOU ARE CORRECT.

WHAT IS THE NORTHERN BORDERING COUNTRY  
OF CHILE?

\*PERU\*

THAT'S RIGHT.

THE WESTERN COAST OF CHILE IS ON THE  
HUMBOLDT CURRENT.  
THE SOUTHERN COAST IS THE ANTARCTIC.  
THE CAPITAL IS SANTIAGO.  
THE REGIONS ARE THE CENTRAL VALLEY, THE  
ATACAMA DESERT, AND THE SOUTHERN ANDES.

SCHOLAR presents a new block  
because the student answered  
both questions correctly.  
Again it skips over information  
the student answered correctly  
on the first pass.

THE SOUTHERN COAST OF CHILE IS ---.

\*ANTARTICA\*

YOU MISSPELLED "ANTARCTIC".  
THAT'S FINE.

IS IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT THE WESTERN  
COAST OF CHILE IS ON THE HUMBOLDT  
CURRENT?

\*YES\*

VERY GOOD.

Fig. 3c. An Annotated Transcript of the Beginning of the Review  
Pass Between Block-Test Mode of SCHOLAR and a High-School  
Student in Exp. 3.

### Testing Procedure

The subjects in the experiments were high-school students paid for their services. They participated in four one-hour sessions with SCHOLAR on two successive Saturdays. In each session they learned about a different South American country. They took a pre-test covering all four countries on the first Saturday before any sessions. Post-tests on the two countries studied each Saturday were given the following Tuesday or Wednesday. Thus the post-test scores measured fairly long-term retention.

On each Saturday the student learned about one country in Tutorial Mode and one in Block-Test Mode. The order of the two modes was reversed for each subject on the two days, and counter-balanced across subjects. The four countries were Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Venezuela. There was slightly more information stored about the first two countries than about the last two. Thus, Brazil was paired with Argentina, and Chile with Venezuela, so that if a student learned about one in Tutorial Mode, he learned about the other in Block-Test Mode. This counterbalancing by country, day, and order determined the eight different orders used for the eight subjects in each experiment.

The sessions were set to run one hour in overall time before SCHOLAR ended the session. The amount of material covered in an hour varied somewhat depending on the response time of the computer. These variations would not produce any systematic differences between the modes, because the order was the counterbalanced



across subjects. However, in the last two experiments, there may have been less material covered than in the first experiment, because of the increased load on the computer.

The post-tests consisted of 50 questions for each country which fairly exhaustively covered the information the student might have learned in the session. The post-test for each country was divided into two separately administered sections, because questions in the second part were likely to give away answers to questions in the first part. To the extent possible, questions were analogous from country to country. The pre-test consisted of 20 questions (a subset of the 50) from each of the four countries; in fact the easiest of the 50 questions. Based on the pre-test scores, none of the students knew much in advance about any of the countries.

The students were given instructions about the typewriter terminals they used and about the particular mode in which they were about to run. They were told they could not ask questions in Block-Test Mode, and in Tutorial Mode in Experiment 3. With Tutorial Mode in Experiments 1 and 2 they were told the form of some types of questions they could ask, with several examples of different kinds.

Questionnaires were given along with the pre-test and final post-test. The pre-test questionnaire was used to make sure none

of the students had extensive experience with computers or with any particular country. There were also several questions related to whether students like to control their own learning or not, to see if these answers had any predictive value with respect to how much students would learn in the different modes. The questionnaire given with the final post-test interrogated students about the effectiveness of different aspects of the two modes.

## EXPERIMENT 1

In the first experiment we attempted to see if clearly different forms of the two strategies would produce a significant difference in the amount of knowledge students acquire. Thus the version of Block-Test Mode used in the first experiment was quite primitive. It proceeded along the same path whether the student answered correctly or incorrectly. This experiment then compared a highly adaptive method of teaching with a non-adaptive method.

Method

In Tutorial Mode, students were introduced to a small number of question types they could ask: the types were "Where is X?" "What is X?" and "Tell me about X." where X could be anything like the Central Valley or temperate. This type of question is useful when SCHOLAR uses a term the student doesn't know about. Students were not strongly encouraged to ask questions, and in fact did not ask many.

The version of Block-Test Mode used in Experiment 1 presented eight pieces of information rather than the four pieces shown in Fig. 3. (Less than eight were presented if it were in a subtopic like Central Valley, where there were less than eight available for selection.) It then went on to ask about each of these eight facts in the order presented. It corrected the student when he

made a mistake, but it did not review any questions the student missed. When the student had been questioned about all eight facts, Block-Test Mode presented the next block of eight facts, and so on until the hour was used up.

### Results and Discussion

The average difference scores between pre- and post-tests for each subject are shown in Table 1, broken down by presentation mode. To analyze the results of the experiment, we used a three-way analysis of variance based on the difference scores with mode, order of the modes, and subjects as the three factors. Since there was only one observation per cell, we took the mean square of the triple interaction as the estimate of error variance. Of the main factors, the effect of mode was significant ( $F(1,7)=17.53$ ,  $p<.01$ ), the effect of subjects was significant ( $F(7,7)=14.45$ ,  $p<.01$ ), and the effect of order was not significant ( $F(1,7)=.38$ ). Of the two-way interactions, the interaction between mode and order was significant ( $F(1,7)=10.58$ ,  $p<.05$ ), and the other two interactions were not: for subjects and mode,  $F(7,7)=.73$ , and for subjects and order,  $F(7,7)=2.71$ . The significant interaction between mode and order reflects the fact that subjects tended to remember the second country they learned about on each day better than the first country. But when Block-Test Mode was second, this effect was more than offset by the mode effect, and so the difference in retention shows up as an interaction.

TABLE 1

Difference Scores between Pre-Test and Post-Test for each Subject, broken down by Presentation Mode in the Three Experiments.

	Experiment 1			Experiment 2			Experiment 3		
	Block-Test Mode	Tutorial Mode	Block-Test Mode	Tutorial Mode	Block-Test Mode	Tutorial Mode	Block-Test Mode	Tutorial Mode	Block-Test Mode
Subjects									
S1	7.0	11.5	14.5	19.5	16.0	17.5	16.0	17.5	17.5
S2	2.0	3.5	12.5	17.0	18.0	13.0	18.0	13.0	13.0
S3	12.0	17.0	10.0	6.0	13.5	16.0	13.5	16.0	16.0
S4	8.0	10.5	1.5	4.5	15.5	11.5	15.5	11.5	11.5
S5	16.5	17.0	3.0	8.0	1.0	7.5	1.0	7.5	7.5
S6	11.0	17.5	7.5	8.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
S7	8.5	12.0	10.5	22.0	14.0	17.5	14.0	17.5	17.5
S8	8.5	11.5	7.5	12.5	9.5	7.0	9.5	7.0	7.0
Average	9.2	12.5	8.4	12.4	11.6	11.9	11.6	11.9	11.9

The two effects we were interested in were the effect of mode, where Tutorial Mode was clearly superior to Block-Test Mode, and the lack of any interaction between mode and subjects. Taken together these two results indicate that the superiority of Tutorial Mode was common to all the students and not just to those who prefer to control their own learning. Hence it is clear that some aspects of Tutorial Mode were of general benefit to student's learning of factual knowledge.

In the first experiment, students did not ask many questions in Tutorial Mode. On a questionnaire given with the final post-test, the students commented favorably about Tutorial Mode and particularly the procedure of going over material more than once. In contrast, they said Block-Test Mode gave them too much information at once. They also felt it was very helpful to get information related to the question they missed in Tutorial Mode. Based on these comments, and the infrequency of questions by the students, the superiority of Tutorial Mode probably was due to its reviewing, to the excess of information presented at one time in Block-Test Mode, and to the difference in the way the two modes combine questioning and presentation.

## EXPERIMENT 2

In the second experiment, we decided to see how a more adaptive version of Block-Test Mode would compare with Tutorial Mode. In view of the student's criticisms of Block-Test Mode, we cut the amount of information in a block to four facts, and included reviewing of questions within a block. At the same time, we strongly encouraged students to ask questions in Tutorial Mode in order to see if this would lead to greater learning in Tutorial Mode.

Method

Eight new students from the same high school were used as subjects. Tutorial Mode was improved in several small ways, but functioned essentially as in the first experiment. However, subjects were encouraged to ask questions and told about a wider variety of questions they could ask, with many more examples given. The main additional types explained to the students were "What?" questions like "What is the climate of the Central Valley?" and true/false questions like "Is Lima in Chile?"

Block-Test Mode was changed drastically in the second experiment. The number of facts presented in each block was cut to four, except

when fewer than four facts were stored with a particular subtopic. Instead of asking about all the facts presented, this version of Block-Test Mode randomly selected two of the facts presented to ask about. It asked an additional question for each one the student missed, up to the number presented. Then it would review any the student missed or did not answer the first time. After this reviewing within the block, it went on to the next block. There was no review pass through the material as there was in Tutorial Mode, nor were the students allowed to ask questions.

### Results and Discussion

The results for Experiment 2 are also shown in Table 1, and again the students learned much more in Tutorial Mode. Of the main effects in the analysis of variance, the effect of mode was significant ( $F(1,7)=6.18, p<.05$ ), the effect of subjects was significant ( $F(7,7)=5.16, p<.05$ ), and the effect of order was not significant ( $F(1,7)=3.48$ ). Of the two-way interactions, none of the effects were significant: for subjects and order  $F(7,7)=.94$ , and for subjects and mode  $F(7,7)=3.75$ , and for order and mode  $F(1,7)=.02$ . There was more variability in the data for this experiment, which may be because of variability in the load on the computer.



In this experiment we eliminated the two aspects of Block-Test Mode that the students complained about; i.e., the excess of information in a block and the failure to review missed questions. However, Tutorial Mode still showed the same large advantage over Block-Test Mode. There were three differences between the two modes that might contribute to this difference in effectiveness: 1) the way they combine questioning and presentation, 2) the allocation of time between a first pass and a review pass in Tutorial Mode and 3) the option for students to ask questions in Tutorial Mode. Only the first of these is inherently different between the modes.

The students were encouraged to ask more questions with Tutorial Mode in this experiment, and in fact they did. Some asked quite a few questions and it looked as if question-asking was a detriment for some and a benefit for others. When a student went off asking questions on his own, the most important information often was not covered. But when the student used questions for clarification, the ability to ask questions was probably quite helpful. This double-edged nature of questions may also have contributed to the increase in variability of the data.

We had expected an overall increase in scores between the two experiments because of the improvements to Block-Test Mode

and the increase in student questions in Tutorial Mode. The fact that there was no improvement in Tutorial Mode may have been due to the double-edged nature of questions. In Block-Test Mode for which there was also no improvement, it may have been due to the failure to ask about every fact presented. Alternatively, it could have been due to the particular groups of subjects, or the fact that the load was slightly heavier on the computer in the second experiment, which would lead to a decrease in material covered. Any comparisons across experiments, though interesting, are somewhat tenuous.

## EXPERIMENT 3

There were three factors then that could have contributed to the large difference between the two modes: 1) the way the modes combine questioning and presentation, 2) the review pass, and 3) the option to ask questions. In order to pin down the contribution of each of these factors, we ran a third experiment converging the two modes toward each other. The first factor was inherently different between the modes so this difference was unchanged. But by adding a review pass to Block-Test Mode, and by removing the option to ask questions in Tutorial Mode, we could parcel out the effect of these different factors.

Method

Eight new subjects were used from the same high school. Tutorial Mode was the same as in the previous experiment, except that the subjects were not told that they could ask questions.

Block-Test Mode was also the same except that it was revised to allocate its time between a first pass and a review pass (see Figure 3c). Thus it did not go as deeply into each topic as the previous version. In the review pass, a block of four facts was followed by a sample of two questions just as in the first pass. But the information the student answered correctly on the first

pass was skipped over on the review pass. A fact was not skipped over, however, if it was presented on the first pass but not asked about, or if the student missed the question about it the first time but answered correctly on the review question within the block. The review pass went over the material to the same depth as the first pass, but any subsequent passes (if time was left) went somewhat deeper.

### Results and Discussion

The results for Experiment 3 are shown in Table 1 where they can be compared to the results of the first two experiments. Of the main effects in the analysis of variance, the effect of subjects was significant ( $F(7,7)=7.67$ ,  $p .01$ ), but neither the effect of mode ( $F(1,7)=.058$ ) nor the effect of order ( $F(1,7)=.669$ ) were significant. None of the interactions were significant: for subjects and mode  $F(7,7)=1.16$ , for subjects and order  $F(7,7)=1.47$ , and for mode and order  $F(1,7)=.058$ .

It is clear that allocating time between a first pass and a review pass eliminated most of the difference between the modes, and so this must have been the major factor contributing to the difference between the modes. The residual difference between the two modes is a measure of the effect of the way the two modes combine questioning and presentation. There seems to be a slight

benefit to the tutorial strategy of questioning first to learn what the student knows, but it is not significant with such a small number of subjects.

The decrease in scores for Tutorial Mode from Experiments 1 and 2 to Experiment 3 is a measure of the effectiveness of the option to ask questions. Though comparisons across experiments are tenuous, the stability of the scores with Tutorial Mode in Experiments 1 and 2 increases confidence in the comparison with Experiment 3. The decrease in Experiment 3 is a small effect, but suggests that the option to ask questions is somewhat beneficial.

## DISCUSSION

The effectiveness of the review pass for the student's learning in the experiments emphasizes the importance of Norman's (1973) notion of web teaching. By including two or more passes in Block-Test Mode, it began to approximate the web-teaching strategy of building a basic framework on one pass, to which new material is added on later passes. The second pass repeats what the student was least certain about on the first pass, so that the repetition is concentrated on the most difficult things to remember. It is a strategy particularly suited to CAI, because computers have perfect memory for what the student answered earlier.

In the experiments there was little benefit from using the tutorial strategy of finding out what the student knows first, and then adding related information. This may reflect the fact that all the students knew practically nothing about South American geography to start with. Therefore, there was little to be gained from an ability to skip over information the student already knew. The real effectiveness of the tutorial strategy is its ability to adapt to the level of the individual student (though Tutorial Mode only partly reflects the human tutor's ability), and the students in these experiments did not have enough knowledge to take advantage of this capability.

The failure of the within block reviewing using Block-Test Mode in Experiment 2 to benefit student's learning probably reflects the spacing effect often found in experimental psychology (Melton, 1970). By spacing repetitions far apart in time as in Experiment 3, the material is more likely to be doubly encoded, whereas repetitions spaced close together as in Experiment 2 are more likely to be encoded only once. Thus the material widely spaced is better remembered.

The method used here can be extended to study many different aspects of teaching methods. It can be used to investigate teaching of different kinds of knowledge other than the factual knowledge in SCHOLAR's geography data base. There are now functioning SCHOLAR systems for teaching users how to use a computer text-editing system (Grignetti, et al., 1974) and for teaching geography with maps (Collins & Warnock, 1974). Another system is planned for teaching functional relations in geography (Collins, et al, 1975). For example the method can be used with the map facility by comparing how well students learn the same material with and without maps. The effectiveness of different methods may vary with the different kinds of knowledge being taught or with different students. Beacuse of its inherent flexibility, the teaching method SCHOLAR uses can be geared to the particular kind of knowledge or even left to the student's choice. This is one of the great potential benefits of generative CAI.

The fact that SCHOLAR can be used to test particular aspects of teaching methods makes it potentially a valuable tool for educational research. The possibility of trying out single modifications in teaching strategy to see their effects on students' learning rate is unique to SCHOLAR. Human teachers of course can make such modifications in their own teaching strategies, but there is no way to control all the other factors that might vary as they changed strategy. However, any specific version of SCHOLAR is a fixed system, and so an unbiased comparison can be made using any number of subjects. In this way the accumulation of systematic knowledge about teaching methods can begin to occur.



## REFERENCES

- Carbonell, J. R. AI in CAI: An artificial intelligence approach to computer-aided instruction. IEEE Transactions on Man-Machine Systems, 1970, MMS-11, 190-202.
- Collins, A. M., and Quillian, M. R. How to make a language user. In E. Tulving and W. Donaldson (Eds.), Organization of Memory. New York: Academic Press, 1972a.
- Collins, A. M. and Quillian, M. R. Experiments on semantic memory and language comprehension. In L. W. Gregg (Ed.) Cognition in learning and memory. New York: Wiley, 1972b.
- Collins, A. M. and Warnock, E. H. Semantic Networks. Cambridge, Mass.: Bolt Beranek and Newman, Report No. 2833, 1974.
- Collins, A. M., Warnock, E. H., and Passafiume, J. J. Analysis and synthesis of tutorial dialogues. To appear in G. H. Bower (Ed.) The psychology of learning and motivation, Vol. 9 New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Collins, A. M., Warnock, E. H., Aiello, N., and Miller, M. W. Reasoning from incomplete knowledge. To appear in in D. G. Bobrow and A. M. Collins (Eds.) Representation and understanding. New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Craik, F. I. M. The fate of primary memory items in free recall. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1970, 9, 143-148.

Grignetti, M. C., Gould, L., Bell, A., Hausmann, C., Passafiume, J. J., and Harris, G. A mixed-initiative tutorial system to aid users of the on-line system (NLS). Cambridge, Mass., Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc. Report, 1974.

Madigan, S. A., and McCabe, L. Perfect recall and total forgetting: A problem for models of short-term memory. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1971, 10, 101-106.

Melton, A. W. The situation with respect to the spacing of repetitions and memory. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1970, 9, 596-606.

Norman, D. A. Memory, knowledge, and the answering of questions. In R. L. Solso (Ed.), Contemporary issues in cognitive psychology: The Loyola symposium. New York: Halsted Press, 1973.

Quillian, M. R. Semantic memory. In M. Minsky (Ed.), Semantic information processing. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1968.

### DISTRIBUTION LIST

- |   |  |    |   |
|---|--|----|---|
| 4 | Dr. Marshall J. Farr, Director<br>Personnel & Training<br>Research Programs<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Arlington, VA 22217                             | 6  | Director<br>Naval Research Laboratory<br>Code 2627<br>Washington, DC 20390  |
| 1 | Director<br>ONR Branch Office<br>495 Summer Street<br>Boston, MA 02210<br>ATTN: C. M. Harsh  | 12 | Defense Documentation<br>Center<br>Cameron Station,<br>Building 5<br>5010 Duke Street<br>Alexandria, VA 22314                                   |
| 1 | Director<br>ONR Branch Office<br>1030 East Green Street<br>Pasadena, CA 91101<br>ATTN: E. E. Gloye   | 1  | Chairman<br>Behavioral Science Department<br>Naval Command and Management<br>Division<br>U.S. Naval Academy<br>Luce Hall<br>Annapolis, MD 21402 |
| 1 | Director<br>ONR Branch Office<br>536 South Clark Street<br>Chicago, IL 60605<br>ATTN: M. A. Bertin   | 1  | Chief of Naval Technical<br>Training<br>Naval Air Station Memphis (75)<br>Millington, TN 38054<br>ATTN: Dr. G. D. Mayo                          |
| 1 | Office of Naval Research<br>Area Office<br>207 West 24th Street<br>New York, NY 10011  | 1  | Chief of Naval Training<br>Naval Air Station<br>Pensacola, FL 32508<br>ATTN: CAPT Bruce Stone, USN  |
| 2 | Director<br>Advanced Research Projects<br>Agency<br>1400 Wilson Boulevard<br>Arlington, VA 22209<br>Attention: Program Management<br>DODAAD Code<br>HXI24T | 1  | TACTEC<br>Battelle Memorial Institute<br>505 King Avenue<br>Columbus, Ohio 43201<br>Attention H8-1 Code<br>79986                                |
| 1 | STOIAIC<br>Battelle Memorial Institute<br>505 King Avenue<br>Columbus, Ohio 43201<br>Attention: H8-1 Code<br>79986   | 1  | Defense Contract Administration<br>Services Region<br>666 Summer Street<br>Boston, MA 02210<br>Attention: DODAAD Code<br>52202A                 |

6 Director  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D.C. 20375  
Attention: DODAAD Code  
N00173  
Code 2629

1 Program Coordinator  
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery  
Code 71G  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, D.C. 20372

1 Commanding Officer  
Naval Medical Neuropsychiatric  
Research Unit  
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Dr. Harold Booher  
NAVAIR 415C  
Naval Air Systems Command  
5600 Columbia Pike  
Falls Church, VA 22042

1 CAPT John F. Riley, USN  
Command Officer  
U.S. Naval Amphibious School  
Coronado, CA 92155

1 Special Assistant for Manpower  
OASN (M&RA)  
The Pentagon, Room 4E794  
Washington, D.C. 20350

1 CDR Richard L. Martin, USN  
COMFAIRMIRAMAR F-14  
NAS Miramar, CA 92145

1 Research Director, Code 06  
Research and Evaluation  
Department  
U.S. Naval Examining Center  
Great Lakes, IL 60088  
ATTN: C. S. Winiewicz

1 Commander  
Naval Air Reserve  
Naval Air Station  
Glenview, IL 60026

1 Commander  
Naval Air Systems Command  
Department of the Navy  
AIR-413C  
Washington, D.C. 20360

1 Mr. Lee Miller (AIR 413E)  
Naval Air Systems Command  
5600 Columbia Pike  
Falls Church, VA 22042

1 Dr. John J. Collins  
Chief of Naval Operations  
(OP-987F)  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, D.C. 20350

1 Technical Library (Pers-11B)  
Bureau of Naval Personnel  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, D.C. 20360

1 Dr. Richard J. Niehaus  
Office of Civilian  
Manpower Management  
Code 06A  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, D.C. 20390

1 Dr. James J. Regan  
Technical Director  
Navy Personnel Research  
and Development Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Chief  
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery  
Code 413  
Washington, D.C. 20372

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1 Mr. Arnold Rubinstein<br/>Naval Material Command<br/>(NMAT-03424)<br/>Room 820, Crystal Plaza #6<br/>Washington, D.C. 20360</p> <p>1 Superintendent<br/>Naval Postgraduate School<br/>Monterey, CA 92940<br/>ATTN: Library (Code 2124)</p> <p>1 Technical Library<br/>Naval Ship Systems Command<br/>National Center, Building 3<br/>Room 3S08<br/>Washington, D.C. 20360</p> <p>1 Chief of Naval Training Support<br/>Code N-21, Building 45<br/>Naval Air Station<br/>Pensacola, FL 32508</p> <p>1 Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko<br/>c/o Office of Naval Research<br/>(Code 450)<br/>Psychological Sciences Division<br/>Arlington, VA 22217</p> <p>1 Commandant<br/>U. S. Army Institute of<br/>Administration<br/>ATTN: EA<br/>Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216</p> <p>1 Armed Forces Staff College<br/>Norfolk, VA 23511<br/>ATTN: Library</p> <p>1 Commander<br/>U. S. Theatre Army Support<br/>Command, Europe<br/>ATTN: Asst. DCSPER (Education)<br/>APO New York 09058</p> | <p>1 Commanding Officer<br/>Naval Personnel Research<br/>and Development Center<br/>San Diego, CA 92152</p> <p>1 Mr. George N. Graine<br/>Naval Ship Systems Command<br/>(SHIPS 03H)<br/>Department of the Navy<br/>Washington, D.C. 20360</p> <p>1 Commanding Officer<br/>Service School Command<br/>U.S. Naval Training Center<br/>San Diego, CA 92133<br/>ATTN: Code 303</p> <p>1 Dr. William L. Maloy<br/>Principal Civilian Advisor<br/>for Education and Training<br/>Naval Training Command,<br/>Code 01A<br/>Pensacola, FL 32508</p> <p>1 Dr. Martin F. Wiskoff<br/>Navy Personnel Research<br/>and Development Center<br/>San Diego, CA 92152</p> <p>1 Chief, Unit Training and<br/>Educational Technology<br/>Systems<br/>U. S. Army Research<br/>Institute for the Behavioral<br/>and Social Sciences<br/>1300 Wilson Boulevard<br/>Arlington, VA 22209</p> <p>1 Director of Research<br/>U. S. Army Armor Human<br/>Research Unit<br/>ATTN: Library<br/>Building 2422 Morade Street<br/>Fort Knox, KY 40121</p> |
|---|---|

- 1 U. S. Army Research Institute  
for the Behavioral and  
Social Sciences  
1300 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Commanding Officer  
ATTN: LTC Montgomery  
USADC - PASA  
Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN 46249
- 1 Dr. John L. Kobrick  
Military Stress Laboratory  
U. S. Army Research Institute  
of Environmental Medicine  
Natick, MA 01760
- 1 Commandant  
United States Army  
Infantry School  
ATTN: ATSIN-H  
Fort Benning, GA 31905
- 1 U. S. Army Research Institute  
Commonwealth Building  
Room 239  
1300 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209  
ATTN: Dr. R. Dusek
- 1 Mr. Edmund F. Fuchs  
U. S. Army Research Institute  
1300 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Dr. Stanley L. Cohen  
Work Unit Area Leader  
Organizational Development  
Work Unit  
Army Research Institute  
for the Behavioral and  
Social Sciences  
1300 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Dr. Leon H. Nawrocki  
U. S. Army Research Institute  
Rosslyn Commonwealth Building  
1300 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Dr. Martin Rockway  
Technical Training Division  
Lowry Air Force Base  
Denver, CO 80230
- 1 Maj. P. J. DeLeo  
Instructional Technology Branch  
AF Human Resources Laboratory  
Lowry AFB, CO 80230
- 1 Headquarters, U.S. Air Force  
Chief, Personnel Research  
and Analysis Division  
(AF/DPSY)  
Washington, DC 20330
- 1 Research and Analysis Division  
AF/DPXYR Room 4C200  
Washington, DC 20330
- 1 AFHRL/AS (Dr. G. A. Eckstrand  
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base  
Ohio 45433
- 1 AFHRL (AST/Dr. Ross L. Morgan  
Wright Patterson Air Force Base)  
Ohio 45433
- 1 AFHRL/MD  
701 Prince Street  
Room 200  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 1 AFOSR(NL)  
1400 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209

- 1 Commandant  
USAF School of Aerospace  
Medicine  
Aeromedical Library (SUL-4)  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 1 CAPT Jack Thorpe, USAF  
Department of Psychology  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, OH 43403
- 1 Headquarters Electronic  
Systems Division  
ATTN: Dr. Sylvia R. Mayer/MCIT  
LG Hanscom Field  
Bedford, MA 01730
- 1 Commandant, Marine Corps  
Code AOIM-2  
Washington, D.C. 20380
- 1 COL George Caridakis  
Director, Office of  
Manpower Utilization  
Headquarters, Marine Corps  
(AO1H), MCB  
Quantico, VA 22134
- 1 Dr. A. K. Slafkosky  
Scientific Advisor (Code Ax)  
Commandant of the Marine Corps  
Washington, DC 20380
- 1 Mr. E. A. Dover  
Manpower Measurement Unit  
(Code AOIM-2)  
Arlington Annex, Room 2413  
Arlington, VA 20370
- 1 Mr. Joseph J. Cowan, Chief  
Psychological Research  
Branch (P-1)  
U. S. Coast Guard Headquarters  
400 Seventh Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20590
- 1 Dr. John Ford, Jr.  
Navy Personnel Research  
and Development Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 LCDR Charles Theisen, Jr.,  
MSC, USN, 4024  
Naval Air Development Center  
Warminster, PA 18974
- 1 Mr. Helga Yeich, Director  
Program Management, Defense  
Advanced Research  
Projects Agency  
1400 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Mr. William J. Stormer  
DOD Computer Institute  
Washington Navy Yard  
Building 175  
Washington, DC 20374
- 1 Dr. Ralph R. Canter  
Director for Manpower Research  
Office of Secretary of Defense  
The Pentagon, Room 3C980  
Washington, DC 20301
- 1 Office of Computer Information  
Institute for Computer Sciences  
and Technology  
National Bureau of Standards  
Washington, DC 20234
- 1 Dr. Eric McWilliams  
Program Manager  
Technology and Systems, TIE  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1 Dr. Scarvia Anderson<br/>Executive Director for Special<br/>Development<br/>Educational Testing Service<br/>Princeton, NJ 08540</p> <p>1 Dr. Richard C. Atkinson<br/>Stanford University<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>Stanford, CA 94305</p> <p>1 Dr. Bernard M. Bass<br/>University of Rochester<br/>Management Research Center<br/>Rochester, NY 14627</p> <p>1 Mr. Edmund C. Berkeley<br/>Berkeley Enterprises, Inc.<br/>815 Washington Street<br/>Newtonville, MA 02160</p> <p>1 Dr. David G. Bowers<br/>University of Michigan<br/>Institute for Social Research<br/>P. O. Box 1248<br/>Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106</p> <p>1 Dr. Ronald P. Carver<br/>American Institutes<br/>for Research<br/>8555 Sixteenth Street<br/>Silver Spring, MD 20910</p> <p>1 Century Research Corporation<br/>4113 Lee Highway<br/>Arlington, VA 22207</p> <p>1 Dr. Robert Glaser, Director<br/>University of Pittsburgh<br/>Learning Research and<br/>Development Center<br/>Pittsburgh, PA 15213</p> | <p>1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark<br/>University of Rochester<br/>College of Arts and Sciences<br/>River Campus Station<br/>Rochester, NY 14627</p> <p>1 Dr. Rene' V. Dawis<br/>University of Minnesota<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>Minneapolis, MN 55455</p> <p>2 ERIC<br/>Processing and Reference<br/>Facility<br/>4833 Rugby Avenue<br/>Bethesda, MD 20014</p> <p>1 Dr. Victor Fields<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>Montgomery College<br/>Rockville, MD 20850</p> <p>1 Mr. H. Dean Brown<br/>Stanford Research Institute<br/>333 Ravenswood Avenue<br/>Menlo Park, CA 94025</p> <p>1 Mr. Michael W. Brown<br/>Operations Research, Inc.<br/>1400 Spring Street<br/>Silver Spring, MD 20910</p> <p>1 Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman<br/>American Institutes for<br/>Research<br/>8555 Sixteenth Street<br/>Silver Spring, MD 20910</p> <p>1 Dr. Albert S. Glickman<br/>American Institutes<br/>for Research<br/>8555 Sixteenth Street<br/>Silver Spring, MD 20910</p> |
|---|---|



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1 Dr. Duncan N. Hansen<br/>Florida State University<br/>Center for Computer-Assisted<br/>Instruction<br/>Tallahassee, FL 32306</p> <p>1 Dr. Henry J. Hamburger<br/>University of California<br/>School of Social Sciences<br/>Irvine, CA 92664</p> <p>1 Dr. Richard S. Hatch<br/>Decision Systems Associates Inc. 1<br/>11428 Rockville Pike<br/>Rockville, MD 20852</p> <p>1 Dr. M. D. Havron<br/>Human Sciences Research, Inc.<br/>Westgate Industrial Park<br/>7710 Old Springhouse Road<br/>McLean, VA 22101</p> <p>1 Human Resources Research<br/>Organization<br/>Division #3<br/>P. O. Box 5787<br/>Presidio of Monterey, CA 93940</p> <p>1 Human Resources Research<br/>Organization<br/>Division #4, Infantry<br/>P. O. Box 2086<br/>Fort Benning, GA 31905</p> <p>1 Human Resources Research<br/>Organization<br/>Division #5, Air Defense<br/>P. O. Box 6057<br/>Fort Bliss, TX 79916</p> <p>1 Human Resources Research<br/>Organization<br/>Division #6, Library<br/>P. O. Box 428<br/>Fort Rucker, AL 36360</p> | <p>1 Dr. Lawrence B. Johnson<br/>Lawrence Johnson and<br/>Associates, Inc.<br/>200 S Street, NW, Suite 502<br/>Washington, DC 20009</p> <p>1 Dr. Norman J. Johnson<br/>Carnegie-Mellon University<br/>Graduate School of<br/>Industrial Admin.<br/>Pittsburgh, PA 15213</p> <p>Dr. David Klahr<br/>Carnegie-Mellon University<br/>Graduate School of<br/>Industrial Admin.<br/>Pittsburgh, PA 15213</p> <p>1 Dr. Robert R. Mackie<br/>Human Factors Research, Inc.<br/>6780 Cortona Drive<br/>Santa Barbara Research Park<br/>Goleta, CA 93017</p> <p>1 Dr. Andrew R. Molnar<br/>Technological Innovations<br/>in Education<br/>National Science Foundation<br/>Washington, DC 20550</p> <p>1 Dr. Leo Munday<br/>Vice President<br/>American College Testing<br/>Program<br/>P.O. Box 168<br/>Iowa City, IA 52240</p> <p>1 Dr. Donald A. Norman<br/>University of California,<br/>San Diego<br/>Center for Human Information<br/>Processing<br/>La Jolla, CA 92037</p> <p>1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo<br/>2431 North Edgewood Street<br/>Arlington, VA 22207</p> |
|---|---|

- |   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | Dr. Robert D. Pritchard<br>Assistant Professor of Psychology<br>Purdue University<br>Lafayette, IN 47907   | 1 | Dr. Benton J. Underwood<br>Northwestern University<br>Department of Psychology<br>Evanston, IL 60201   |
| 1 | Dr. Diane M. Ramsey-Klee<br>R-K Research & System Design<br>3947 Ridgemont Drive<br>Malibu, CA 90265   | 1 | Dr. David J. Weiss<br>University of Minnesota<br>Department of Psychology<br>Minneapolis, MN 55455   |
| 1 | Dr. Joseph W. Rigney<br>Behavioral Technology<br>Laboratories<br>University of Southern<br>California<br>3717 South Grand<br>Los Angeles, CA 90007 | 1 | Denver Research Institute<br>University of Denver<br>Denver, CO 80210  |
| 1 | Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum, Chairman<br>Department of Psychology<br>Montgomery College<br>Rockville, MD 20850  | 1 | Dr. Kenneth Wexler<br>University of California<br>School of Social Sciences<br>Irvine, CA 92664  |
| 1 | Dr. George E. Rowland<br>Rowland and Company, Inc.<br>P. O. Box 61<br>Haddonfield, NJ 08033  | 1 | Dr. John Annett<br>The Open University<br>Milton Keynes<br>Buckinghamshire<br>ENGLAND  |
| 1 | Dr. Arthur I. Siegel<br>Applied Psychological<br>Services and Science Center<br>404 East Lancaster Avenue<br>Wayne, PA 19087                       | 1 | Dr. Milton S. Katz<br>MITRE Corporation<br>Westgate Research Center<br>McLean, VA 22101  |
| 1 | Mr. Dennis J. Sullivan<br>725 Benson Way<br>Thousand Oaks, CA 91360  | 1 | Dr. Charles A. Ullmann<br>Director, Behavioral<br>Sciences Studies<br>Information Concepts<br>Incorporated<br>1701 No. Ft. Myer Drive<br>Arlington, VA 22209 |
| 1 | Mr. Dexter Fletcher<br>Department of Psychology<br>University of Illinois<br>at Chicago Circle<br>Box 4348<br>Chicago, IL 60680                    | 1 | Dr. Anita West<br>Denver Research Institute<br>University of Denver<br>Denver, CO 80210  |